

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, and 13-15 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 6 are amended, and claims 16-18 are canceled. The amendment to claims 1 and 6 is supported by Figure 2 of the present specification. No new matter is added. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiners Korobov and Najjar at the interview held on April 7 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

I. Objection and 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph, Rejection

The Office Action objects to claim 17 and rejects claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 16-18 are canceled. Thus, the objection and §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 16-18, respectively, are now moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection and §112 rejection.

II. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 5-6, 11, 13-14, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe (U.S. Patent No. 5,819,301). The rejection as it pertains to canceled claims 16-18 is now moot. However, Applicants respectfully traverse the §102(b) rejection as it pertains to claims 1, 5-6, 11, and 13-14.

Specifically, Applicants assert that Rowe does not suggest or disclose a document data transmission device having at least a storage means for storing plural documents including plural pages, the storage means further storing plural summary data corresponding to the plural documents, each summary data including contents information and definitions of information, as recited in independent claims 1 and 6.

Rowe discloses providing document information in an optimized electronic document including page content information specifying the appearance of each page of the document (column 6, lines 49-50), a page offset hint table providing information sufficient to locate respective page content information for each of substantially all the pages of the document (Figure 8A and column 6, lines 55-58), a bookmark for allowing a user to select and display a particular portion of the document (column 11, lines 53-55), and a range table providing the offsets and lengths for the page contents and shared objects of the first page of the document which functions somewhat like a page offset table (Figure 9A and column 15, lines 55-59). Rowe, however, fails to disclose a document data transmission device having at least summary data, each summary data including contents information and definitions of information, as recited in claims 1 and 6.

III. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection

The Office Action rejects claims 3-4, 8-9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Weideman (U.S. Patent No. 6,775,519). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Specifically, Applicants assert that neither Rowe nor Weideman, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest a document data transmission system having at least a user terminal for transmitting a page data transmission request requesting to transmit the specific page to the document data transmission device through a ground-based network, and a page data transmitting means for transmitting the specific page data contained in the specific document data to the user terminal through a satellite network, on the basis of the page data transmission request received by the page data transmission request receiving means, as recited in claim 9.

Rowe discloses transmitting data through the Internet. Rowe, however, fails to disclose a document data transmission system having at least a user terminal for transmitting

a page data transmission request requesting to transmit the specific page to the document data transmission device through a ground-based network, and a page data transmitting means for transmitting the specific page data contained in the specific document data to the user terminal through a satellite network, as recited in claim 9.

Weidman discloses a method for operating a satellite communications system for coupling a user terminal to a data communications network by establishing a connectionless packet data transmission link between the user terminal and a gateway that is coupled to the user terminal through at least one satellite via an inbound link and an outbound link and coupling user terminals (*not* a user terminal and a gateway) via the terrestrial (ground) segment to the Internet. Weidman, however, also fails to disclose a document data transmission system having at least a user terminal for transmitting a page data transmission request requesting to transmit the specific page to the document data transmission device through a ground-based network, and a page data transmitting means for transmitting the specific page data contained in the specific document data to the user terminal through a satellite network, as recited in claim 9, and therefore, does not make up for the deficiencies of Rowe.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that neither Rowe or Weidman, individually or in combination, disclose or suggest a document data transmission system having at least a user terminal for transmitting a page data transmission request requesting to transmit the specific page to the document data transmission device through a ground-based network, and a page data transmitting means for transmitting the specific page data contained in the specific document data to the user terminal through a satellite network, on the basis of the page data transmission request received by the page data transmission request receiving means, as recited in claim 9. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that there is no motivation, either in Rowe or Weideman, to combine the references.

IV. Conclusion

In accordance with the above remarks, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 6, and 9 define patentable subject matter. Claims 3-5, 8, 11, and 13-15 depend from claims 1, 6, and 9, respectively, and therefore, also define patentable subject matter. Thus Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, and 13-15 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Bogdan A. Zinchenko
Registration No. 57,473

JAO:BAZ/hs

Date: April 11, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
